Demonstrate For Peace: *Put Your Body Where It Will Count*

The Question Nixon Never Answered

The President feels it is not in the national interest to set a date. The Secretary of Defense said there would be no total withdrawal until the prisoners are released. What no one in the Administration has explained is how 50,000 troops left in South Vietnam for air and logistical support can persuade North Vietnam to negotiate seriously if 500,000 could not.
—Mrs. Gerald A. Gartley, Dunedin, Fla., mother of a POW flier, before House Foreign Affairs, March 31.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XIX, No. 8 April 19, 1971 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

What Nixon Hopes We Won't Remember

One passage in Nixon's Vietnam address of April 7 has escaped the attention it deserves. It shows better than any other how dishonest the man is. "When I left Washington in January of 1961, after serving eight years as Vice President under Eisenhower," Nixon said, "there were no American combat forces in Vietnam. No Americans had died in combat. When I returned as President eight years later, there were 540,000 Americans in Vietnam. Thirty-one thousand had died there." Nixon pictures himself as a man who kept the peace in Indochina only to have the Democrats drag us into war after he left office. The truth is that if Richard Nixon had had his way American boys would have begun to die in Vietnam a decade earlier, and intervention when it began under Kennedy and Johnson would have been wider and bloodier. Nixon has been the foremost hawk of the Indochinese adventure, and this old emotional and ideological attachment explains his stubborn effort to carry it through to some kind of a victory at whatever cost.

In The Name Of Self-Determination

As early as April 16, 1954, in an address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors Nixon proposed the U.S. send its own troops into Indochina if France gave up the fight and made peace at Geneva. "I have visited Vietnam many times," Nixon said the other night in his latest appeal for public support in bringing about a "just peace." Indeed he has, and in every visit he has sought to deepen American entanglement. One of the earliest was his visit to Hanoi (then still in French hands) in November, 1963, to make a speech opposing the idea of a negotiated peace and head off the Geneva conference. Another visit is worth keeping in mind as we approach another rigged Presidential election in South Vietnam to keep Thieu in power. That visit was on July 6, 1956. Diem had just succeeded in electing himself a rubber-stamp Constituent Assembly by suppressing many independent candidatures, arresting many opposition leaders* and by so restricting freedom of speech and press that most of the opposition finally boycotted the elections. Nixon in an address to the Assembly said "the entire free world" derived "great inspiration" from Diem's achievements. When Nixon tells us as he did in his latest speech that we must hang on and end the war in a way which will achieve the goal of "a South Vietnam free to determine its own future," it is well to remember that first fake election under Diem. For two decades we have been imposing puppet regimes on Saigon in the name of self-determination. But the stale double-talk still goes on.

***The widely respected and still active Dr. Pham Quang Dan, then leader of the Republican party, was one of those arrested for distributing leaflets protesting the terms of Diem's electoral law. Keesing's Archives (London) pp. 14,951-2, for 1956.**

Speaking Of Restraint In Judgment (Or When Agnew Bites Nixon)

Now most knowledgeable people realize that you cannot fully assess the effect of that military operation [in Laos] at this time. There are exaggerated claims by both sides. We firmly *believe* [italics in original] the operation has been successful for the South Vietnamese and that, as in Tet and Cambodia, the enemy has paid a heavy price and has been greatly weakened. But only the future will show for certain. This would seem to call for restraint in judgment.
—Agnew in Los Angeles, April 7 Noon PST.

The disruption of enemy supply lines, the consumption of ammunition and arms in the battle [in Laos] has been even more damaging to the capability of the North Vietnamese to sustain major offensives in South Vietnam than were the operations in Cambodia ten months ago. Consequently tonight I can report that Vietnamization has succeeded.
—Nixon from the White House that evening.

Nixon says that when he left office as Vice President in January 1961 there were no American combat forces in Vietnam. He did not say he soon did all he could to put them in. In February 1962 after Kennedy sent General Harkins to Vietnam to head a U.S. Military Assistance Command, the Republican National Committee's publication, *Battle Line* (Feb. 13), declared that Kennedy had been "less than candid" about U.S. military involvement, asked whether we were moving toward "a new Korea" and said the American people should not have to wait "until American casualty lists are posted" before knowing the full truth. Two days later Nixon disagreed in a statement saying—

I don't agree at all with any partisan or other criticism of the U.S. buildup in Vietnam. My only question is whether it may be too little and too late . . . I support President Kennedy to the hilt, and I only hope he will step up the buildup and under no circumstances curtail it because of possible criticism.

Shortly afterward "18 Notables," including Roman Catholic leaders, appealed first to Diem and then to the U.S. Ambassador (March 13, 1962) for the restoration of elementary political and civil rights, declaring that popular support had been alienated by widespread repression. Nixon turned as deaf an ear as Kennedy to this appeal for the freedom we were supposedly defending.

In 1964 as the presidential campaign warmed up, Nixon said Lyndon Johnson, then pretending to be dovish, "lacks the idealism and sense of purpose" both Eisenhower and Kennedy "were able to project" and that under Johnson it was

(Continued on Page Four)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Time Is Ripe For A Full Investigation Into the FBI's Surveillance of Politics

THE IDEA THAT FBI INVASIONS OF LIBERTY are an aberration of J. Edgar Hoover's old age is nonsense. This has been the pattern of the Bureau ever since its creation. Under its first chiefs, the notorious Bielaski brothers, it ran the "deportations delirium" which marked the Red hunt after World War I. Hoover showed his suspicion of liberals during the New Deal. During World War II, I published a series of articles in the newspaper *PM* based on the transcripts of some 20 FBI loyalty interrogations. These showed that Federal employees made themselves suspect by such activities as having blacks as guests in their homes or reading *Nation* or *New Republic*. During the Coplon espionage trial in 1949 a Federal judge ordered the FBI to make public the wiretap and other records in that case. A National Lawyers Guild committee including former FCC commissioner Clifford Durr and Prof. Thomas I. Emerson of Yale released a study of these internal FBI records in January 1950. This showed that FBI wiretaps had less to do with possible crime than with "social, political and economic views." Some publisher should reprint that report and the documents recently stolen from FBI records in Media, Pa., for an in-depth look at our political police.

A Sacred Cow Too Long

The witch hunt after World War II began when Hoover "loaned" Robert E. Lee, now an FCC commissioner, to a Republican House committee to compile a list of suspect Federal employes. This list was the origin of the one used by Joe McCarthy, whom Hoover admired. After the Republicans came back to power in 1953 Hoover joined the G.O.P. in calling Democratic rule "20 Years of Treason." The Media documents disclosed that the FBI seeks deliberately to provoke paranoid attitudes on the Left, to make people think there is an FBI man behind every mail box and a tap on every phone. Hoover can hardly complain if this paranoia has spread to Congress. Hoover denies the phones of any Congressmen have been tapped. In an article (*58 Yale Law Journal 401*) in 1949 Hoover declared, "The FBI does not, has not, and never will as long as I am director investigate political views." The Coplon documents soon showed this was untrue. In an unwary moment Deputy Attorney General Kleindienst on CBS April 7 indignantly replied to the wiretap charges of Congressman Hale Boggs by calling for a Congressional investigation into "the methods, the procedures and the policies of the FBI, not only now but in the past." Then 24 hours later he backed down and proposed a narrow inquiry only into the Boggs' charges. This is the time to demand the fuller investigation by Senator Sam J. Ervin's vigilant Constitutional Rights subcommittee. When *Life* magazine puts Hoover on its cover as a Roman Emperor, and he becomes a target of the mass media, the time is ripe for an investigation. Hoover has been a sacred cow too long.

NIXON'S INTERVENTION IN THE CALLEY CASE was cheap opportunism, but the peace movement may easily drift into the same posture by covertly pandering to Know Nothingism with demagogic slogans about Calley being only a scapegoat. Certainly the higher-ups in this war should be investigated for war crimes. Johnson, Rusk and McNamara as well as Nixon, Laird and Westmoreland all share the guilt. But Calley wasn't convicted of war crimes in the Nuremburg sense. He was convicted of violating the U.S. Army's admirable Rules of War in shooting nonresistant men, women and children. Many army officers take these rules very seriously; this was demonstrated by the panel of officers, all combat veterans, who convicted Calley. The trial and Capt. Aubrey Daniel's eloquent letter of protest to Nixon do our country honor; I know of no other which can show a like prosecution in the midst of a war. To join the right in palliating Calley's crimes is to alienate the best military officers from the movement for peace—and to make Asians feel we forget humanitarianism in dealing with them.

White House Invitation To Demonstrate

Q: As a practical matter is it hoped and expected that this may quiet the public clamor over this whole matter [the Calley conviction]?

John Ehrlichman [Asst. to the President for Domestic Affairs]: I think that is certainly not one of the motives. I think the feeling is that there had been enough sincere questions about what is going to happen in this whole process that they deserved an answer. But I don't think it is on the basis of asking people not to make their feelings known. Obviously, it is part of the democratic process for people to make their feelings known. This is good.

—Briefing on Calley, San Clemente, April 3.

What The Tell-It-To-Hanoi Crowd Never Tell The U.S. About Prisoners of War

When they [Major Thompson and Major Carpenter] were released, they were soon assigned by the Air Force as instructors of other pilots. It seems incomprehensible to me that the Vietnamese would release captured pilots if they are to be put to training other men to go and do the same thing they have been doing in Vietnam.

—Stewart Meacham of the Friends at the House Foreign Affairs hearing on POWs March 31. (Abridged)

Previous to our trip in December 1969, prisoners had been allowed to receive packages only for holidays and special occasions. Since then, however, 6-pound packages every other month have been permitted . . .

According to the families, packages are being acknowledged and gourmet requests are frequently made and honored. Items such as dried foods, vitamins, proteins, socks, thermal underwear, T-shirts, blue-jeans, handkerchiefs, reading glasses and air mattresses are among the long list of allowable items. This is hardly compatible with what Secretary Rogers, in one of his more sweeping flights of rhetoric, has referred to as "the most barbaric treatment in the history of man."

COL has accepted and delivered to Hanoi special items to be hand-carried with mail, such as reading glasses, an extra supply of penicillin for a pilot with a terminal kidney condition, a brace for a pilot with an injured leg, and specific medications.

—Cora Weiss, Co-Chairman of the Committee of Liaison with Families of POWs, same hearings.

It is impossible to know with certainty what is happening in the prison camps. The fact that 20 out of a total of 368 POW's (6%) have died strongly suggests that the treatment North Vietnam accords Americans in their power is far better than the Japanese treatment of prisoners during the Second World War when 27% of the prisoners died. It is unquestionably better than the treatment accorded to North Vietnamese and Viet Cong prisoners by South Vietnamese and Americans. . . . The execution of VC prisoners, such as the one 1st Lt. James Duffy shot in September 1969 and for which he was convicted of involuntary manslaughter and fined $250, has been commonplace.

—Richard J. Barnet, ex-State Department official and defense consultant, same hearings.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Surest Way To Curb The Nuclear Arms Race Is To End Underground Testing

THE SWIFTEST WAY TO STOP THE ARMS RACE is to stop underground testing. An *AP* dispatch from Mercury, Nev., we saw only in the *Washington Star* April 11, disclosed that testing had been halted ever since an underground test last Dec. 18 burst through and vented radioactivity over 13 Western states. This was the longest halt since Eisenhower unilaterally initiated moratoriums on atmospheric testing which lasted from 1958 to 1961, when the Russians broke the ban by testing. While the AEC investigated the accidental outburst of last December, "the prototypes of future nuclear weapons," the *AP* said, "sit in the laboratories at Berkeley and Los Alamos." Our heart is breaking. The AEC told the AP, "There is only so far you can go theoretically. Then you have to go out and test it." The tempo of testing has grown since the limited test ban treaty put all testing underground. The AEC has "announced" (an undisclosed number are kept secret) 228 U.S. and 47 Soviet tests in those eight years; in the 18 years before the treaty there were 210 U.S. and 126 Soviet tests. Without the underground tests there would be no ABM and no MIRV.

Strange Way To National Security

A secret meeting of scientists last summer at Woods Hole, Mass., on the problem of detecting underground tests surfaced April 11 in a *Washington Post* scoop by Thomas O'Toole and Marilyn Berger. In 5 years the level of detectability has gone down from 20 kilotons to 1 kt (1,000 pounds). Nuclear tests below 1,000 pounds are rare and of little value. A ban on underground tests and an ABM agreement might still brake the proliferating MIRV menace. Its gravity was emphasized when the first Poseidon submarine was deployed April 1, Fool's day—symbolically ideal. For this first Poseidon, with at least 10 separately targetable MIRV warheads on each of its 16 launchers, can wipe out 116 Soviet cities (they only have about 60 cities with population over 100,000!). Thirty more Poseidons are to follow in this insane race for overkill and soon the Soviets too will be able with one submarine to hit 116 of our cities. Some fun! Some way for U.S. and USSR to become—as the military-scientific maniacs assure us and them—more secure!

SOME WONDER WHY THERE IS NOT MORE OUTCRY from people like ourselves about the civil war in Pakistan. Certainly West Pakistan is guilty of suppressing the majority in East Pakistan by methods fully as cruel as those we have been using in Vietnam. But it is more important to keep the war from spreading into a general conflagration. The history of conflict in Bengal is witness to human ferocity. First Hindu and Muslim Bengalis slaughtered each other when India was divided. Now that the Muslim Pathans of West Pakistan are killing the Muslim Bengali of East Pakistan, the Hindu Bengalis are sympathetic to their brethren. But for how long? Could they submerge religious fanaticism and live together in one Bengal state? All we can do is ask U.S., USSR and China to stop supplying arms to West Pakistan, and join in a united call for peace.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION NOTE: The *Washington Star* April 11 revealed that nine farms received more than $1 million each in crop subsidies in 1970, and 14 others more than $500,000 each. A UPI item in the *Washington Post* same day disclosed that the Agriculture Dept. is charging $150 a copy for the total list of 137,000 subsidized farmers. Otherwise there is only a single copy available for inspection in a closely guarded records room. Agriculture Dept. always has been tender toward rich farmers.

FOOTNOTE ON THE POW HYSTERIA: Too few Americans seem to realize that the Geneva convention on prisoners of war provides for their release only after the end of hostilities.

Look Who's Worrying About Thieu and Ky

When Humphrey was asked recently about his position, he said that he had been for a U.S. pull-out since his speech in Salt Lake City in October 1968. That isn't the way the speech was remembered by reporters who were there, with some interpreting it as dovish and others calling it hawkish. The text itself was thought by some to be couched in ambiguities. As recently as last December 10, before Humphrey had joined the McGovern-Hatfield drive, he was emphasizing caution and warning against "crypto-isolationism." He said that he wanted to be sure the Democrats did not go berserk, cop out or try to withdraw from the world order. With specific reference to Vietnam, Humphrey said, "I think President Nixon wants to get out. I would have been proceeding that way, but a little more carefully. We have to be careful not to let Thieu and Ky collapse."

—Richard Dudman St. Louis Post Dispatch *March 7.*

Fulbright on Israel's Self-Reliance and the U.S. Addiction to Anti-Communism

For reasons which may warrant our sympathy, but not our support, Israel pursues a policy of antiquated—and to a great degree delusional—self reliance. As Foreign Minister Eban expressed it, "a nation must be capable of tenacious solitude." In fact, Israel is heavily dependant on the U.S. Only last December Congress appropriated a half billion dollars for military assistance to Israel. Since 1948 the U.S. Government has provided $1.4 billion in direct economic assistance to Israel; this does not include military aid. Included have been aircraft, missiles and electronic systems more advanced than those provided to NATO and SEATO. I do not see how this can be reconciled with a policy of "tenacious solitude."

Premier Meir says we ought not to press for Israeli withdrawal from the conquered Arab territories because as she puts it, "This is not the border of the USA. . . ." If Israel, as the Premier says, really were prepared to "stand up for itself" without involving others, it might make sense to let the Arabs and Israelis work out their differences, or fight them out. We all know, however, that this is not the case, that American interests of the most crucial nature are involved, that another war in the Middle East might well set us against the Russians, and that, therefore, we have the right to bring an influence to bear.

Israel has a different conception of American interests in the Middle East, an essentially cold war conception. Picturing herself as the bastion of democracy in the Middle East, Israel professes to be defending American interests by holding the line against a surging tide of Communist imperialism. I perceive in this some of the same old Communist-baiting humbuggery that certain other small countries have used to manipulate the United States for their own purposes. When it comes to anti-communism, as we have noted in Vietnam and elsewhere, the United States is highly susceptible, rather like a drug addict, and the world is full of ideological "pushers." It is a fine thing to respect a small country's independence. It is quite another when really because of our continuing obsession with communism we permit client states like Israel and South Vietnam to manipulate American policy contrary to our interests, and probably to theirs as well.

—Sen. Fulbright, at Yale, April 4, abridged.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As Early As 1964 Nixon Wanted Invasions of Laos and The North

(Continued from Page One)

hard to find a place on the map of the world "where the U.S. is not being kicked around, insulted, blackmailed or threatened." This struck the first note of Nixon's now familiar "poor, pitiful giant" theme. On his return from a tour of Asia (April 16) he called for military action against bases in North Vietnam and Laos to show the "enemy he can no longer have privileged sanctuary," and repeated a call for "hot pursuit" into Laos and North Vietnam in a speech two days later before that favorite forum of his, the American Society of Newspaper Editors. "To win the war," he told them, "the initiative must be carried north." Perhaps Nixon (who was about to address the Society again as this was written) likes to address our senior editors because they so obligingly forget what he does not wish the public to remember.

Against A Negotiated Withdrawal

When Johnson finally began to bomb North Vietnam and to send in combat troops in 1965, it was a triumph for Nixon. He opened the year by proposing (Jan. 26) that the U.S. Navy and Air Force be used to bomb supply routes and staging areas in Laos and Vietnam; he conceded this might bring a direct conflict wtih China but said negotiation would be tantamount to "surrendering on the installment plan." After Johnson's first air raids on North Vietnam in February, Nixon declared them insufficient and called for U.S. warplanes to bomb supply lines "day by day, and for that matter, night by night" (Feb. 10). Fifteen days later he asked Johnson to reject any peace talks that would require U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam. On April 2 he approved Johnson's introduction of gas warfare. In September after Johnson had widened the war in the air and on the ground, Nixon returned from another visit to Vietnam and (*Meet the Press,* Sept. 12) declared himself more optimistic. He called for the bombing of military targets in Hanoi and two months later (same program, Nov. 21) asked Johnson to mine Haiphong harbor. In November he joined Dean Acheson in signing a Freedom House manifesto saying that critics of the war "have a right to be heard, but they impose on the rest of us the obligation to make unmistakably clear the nation's firm commitment" to Vietnam.

Mathematical Miracles In Laos

"Look at it this way," a doubtful American officer said. "The Vietnamese said they have killed nearly 14,000 Communists in Laos. If you figure that at least two are wounded for every soldier killed, that means at least 42,000 Communists were put out of action. Since there were supposed to be only 30,000 Communists in the area in Laos, they are now minus 12,000."

"Now the command says we killed something like 15,000 trucks along the trail since the dry season began in October," he continued. "They had only about 12,000, so again Hanoi is short, this time about 3,000 trucks. So, if they are minus 9,000 men and 3,000 trucks, it's a wonder they can still keep going.

—Alvin Shuster from Saigon, N.Y. Times *April 1.*

Johnson could never do enough in Vietnam to please Nixon. In August of 1966, after another visit to Vietnam, Nixon called for a 25 percent increase in U.S. troops, bringing the total to 500,000 men. He said he was "convinced" that such a massive buildup would reduce casualties! He warned the American Legion later that month "if Vietnam falls, the Pacific will be transformed into a Red ocean." A year later he was still echoing military criticism of Johnson for "gradual escalation" and calling instead (Boston Aug. 21, 1967) for "massive pressure" short only of nuclear weapons. In October of that year in Chicago Nixon reached a new point of hysteria. He declared the alternative to a "successful" conclusion of the Vietnam war might be World War III. He said it was necessary to make the American people realize U.S. "vital strategic interests" in the conflict and to bring home to them that "this war is about peace and freedom in the world." In February 1968 he criticized Johnson's "bombing pause," a pause in which some people hoped negotiations might begin.

Can a man so tricky and so brazen as to so distort that past record ever be trusted? The record helps us to understand what Nixon meant on April 7 when he appealed for support "to end this war—but to end it in a way that will strengthen trust for America around the world." What he means is not trust but fear. What he means is that America's will must be imposed on Indochina, at whatever cost to its people and ours.

We'll Send A Free Sample Copy Of This Issue To A Friend If You Send Us A Long, Stamped, Self Addressed Envelope

Bi-Weekly Mart

—To subscribe or to send a gift subscription, send $5 with your address and zip code to the address below.

—To get Stone's new collection, **"Polemics and Prophecies: 1967-70"** (Random House: $10) at the special $8.95 price postpaid for Bi-Weekly readers, send check or money order to the address below.

—If you want Stone's new paperback, **"The Killings at Kent State: How Murder Went Unpunished"** (New York Review and Vintage Press) the price is $1.95. It contains the full text, available nowhere else, of the so-called "secret FBI report", the summary of FBI findings prepared by the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department but never submitted to the Ohio Grand Jury.

—Stone's **"Hidden History of the Korean War"**, the inside story of America's first Vietnam, long out of print is available again (Monthly Review Press) $7.50 postpaid.

—Paperback editions (Vintage Press) of Stone's earlier collections, **"In A Time of Torment"** ($1.95) and **"The Haunted Fifties"** ($2.45) at bookstores.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly
4420 29th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20008
$5 A YEAR 4/19/71

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly
4420 29th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Plans For The Double Issue On SALT Were Delayed By The Nixon Report April 7

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED